

REMARKS

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7, and 9-11 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled. Claims 5 and 12 are canceled.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. Patent 5,862,223) in view of Knee et al. (U.S. Patent 5,589,892). However, in the present invention “said first user is a customer and said request information is a request for an offer to sell goods matching the request to said customer” and “said second user is a shop and said service information is said offer.” (Claims 1 and 7) In other words, customers submit their requests for goods over the network to an agent server. Shops can then request from the agent server a list of the submitted requests for their goods. The shops can then service any relevant requests by sending an offer back to the agent server. The customers can then request a list of their previously submitted requests to see whether any shops have serviced their requests (i.e. sent in an offer). By contrast, Walker is directed to an electronic marketplace for consulting services. Walker is not directed to the sale of goods by a shop. Hence, Walker fails to meet the


present invention's "offer to sell goods" and "said second user is a shop" limitations as required in the claims. Knee is directed to an electronic programming guide that can associate products for purchase with the shows listed in the guide. Knee does not disclose a request for an offer from a customer or that a shop can service that request. Hence, Knee fails to meet the present invention's "request for an offer to sell goods matching the request to said customer" and "said second user is a shop and said service information is said offer" limitations. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Walker and Knee fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Darren M. Simon
Reg. No. 47,946
(212) 588-0800